



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,903	10/21/2003	Adam J. Weissman	16113-0329001	3982
26192 7590 04/30/2012 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
SHECHTMAN, CHERYL MARIA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2157				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2012		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/689,903

Applicant(s)

WEISSMAN ET AL.

Examiner

CHERYL M. SHECHTMAN

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-22, 24-28, 30 and 36-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-22, 24-28, 30 and 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/7/12; 10/13/09; 9/11/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to RCE after BPAI decision filed June 24, 2011. Claims 1-9, 11-22, 24-28, 30, and 36-40 are pending. Claims 1-914-22, 28, 30, 36-38 and 40 are amended. Claims 10, 23, 29, and 31-35 are cancelled.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 7, 2012 is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-22, 24-28, 30 and 36-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

4. Referring to claim 28, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *previously matched advertisements are caused to be on a previously received source web page document*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Remarks

5. The limitation "previously received source web page document" recited by claims 1 and 14 are interpreted by the Examiner to be referencing the received source web page document, in light of Applicant's remarks filed June 24, 2011 (page 1, para. 4), wherein Applicant states that the claims have been amended to specify the order of the recited activities. Similar interpretation is made with regard to limitations "previously identified region", "previously determined local concepts", "previously identified unrelated concepts", and "previously determined source meaning".

6. The limitation "previously received web page document" recited by claim 36 is interpreted by the Examiner to be referencing the received web page document, in light of Applicant's remarks filed June 24, 2011 (page 1, para. 4), wherein Applicant states that the claims have been amended to specify the order of the recited activities. Similar interpretation is made with regard to limitations "previously identified regions", "previously determined first concept", and "previously determined source meaning".

7. The limitation "previously accessed source web page document" recited by claim 28 is interpreted by the Examiner to be referencing the accessed source web page document in light of Applicant's remarks filed June 24, 2011 (page 1, para. 4), wherein Applicant states that the claims have been amended to specify the order of the recited activities. Similar interpretation is made with regard to limitations "previously identified

first content region", "previously identified second content region", "previously determined first and second local concepts", and "previously matched advertisements".

8. Applicant is advised that should claim 11 be found allowable, claim 25 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

9. Applicant is advised that should claim 12 be found allowable, claim 26 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

10. Applicant is advised that should claim 13 be found allowable, claim 27 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 1-9, 11-22, 24-27, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
12. Referring to claims 1 and 14, the claims recite the limitation "...wherein a local concept expressed in a region is a concept.." in para. 4 of the claims. However, it is unclear as to whether the recited 'a region' is meant to reference the previously recited 'identified plurality of regions' in para. 3.
13. Referring to claims 1 and 14, the claims recite the limitation "...with local concepts of other regions.." in para. 5 of the claims. However, it is unclear as to whether the recited 'other regions' is meant to reference the previously recited 'identified plurality of regions' in para. 3.
14. The term "relatively low degree of relationship" in claims 1 and 36 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "relatively low degree of relationship" is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.
15. Claims 1 and 14 recite the limitation "the relevant concepts" in para. 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

16. Claim 12 recites the limitation "...identifying unrelated regions comprises...". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim and claims 1 and 11 from which it depends.

17. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the source article". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

18. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the related local concepts". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

19. Claim 25 recites the limitation "the article of claim 1". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

20. Claim 26 recites the limitation "...identifying unrelated regions comprises...". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim and claims 1 and 25 from which it depends.

21. Referring to claim 36, it is unclear as to what is meant by the limitation "...wherein concept is expressed in a region two or more words in the region are aligned with the concept" in para. 4 of the claim.

22. Referring to claim 36, the claim recites the limitation "...wherein concept expressed in a region..." in para. 4 of the claim. However, it is unclear as to whether the recited 'a region' is meant to reference the previously recited 'identified collection of different regions' in para. 3.

23. Referring to claim 36, the claim recites the limitation "...a vector of representative concepts expressed..." in para. 6. However it is unclear as to whether the limitation

"representative concepts expressed" is meant to reference the "determined contents expressed" as recited in para. 4 of the claim.

All claims depending from the aforementioned claims are also hereby rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

Due to the 35 USC 112 rejections, the claims have been examined as best understood by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

24. Claims 14-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
25. Referring to claim 14, the claim is directed to an article comprising one or more computer-readable media containing program code. However, this claim recites non-statutory subject matter because the instant specification [*para. 15*] recites that the computer-readable media can include transmission media which could include carrier waves, which are considered non-statutory due to their transient nature.

Claims 15-22 and 24 inherit the aforementioned deficiencies by virtue of their dependencies and are thereby also rejected for the same reasons.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four

statutory categories of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

26. Claims 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,484,161 issued to Chipalkatti et al (hereafter Chipalkatti).

Referring to claim 28, Chipalkatti discloses a method for matching regions in articles to advertisements [*see Abstract; Title of Invention; Fig. 3 and related portions of specification*], the method performed by a document server implemented as a network of computer processors or as a single computer system, the document server executing a document engine [*query engine 862, webserver engine 852, Fig. 4 and related portions of specification*], the method comprising:

accessing a source web page document [*wherein a user accesses GTE superpages Internet site, col. 5, lines 58-61*];

identifying a first content region and a second content region in the previously accessed source web page document [*wherein 'business name/category' and 'address' content regions are identified, see Fig. 3, elements 1802 and 1804, col. 5, lines 58-67*];

determining a first local concept expressed in the previously identified first content region and determining a second local concept expressed in the previously identified second content region [*wherein 'name match' procedure for business name entries is performed and 'derives score' procedure for zipcode or address entries, col. 40, lines 54-63*], wherein determining the first and second local concepts comprises identifying words in the respective of the first and second content regions and aligning the words with concepts, wherein a local concept expressed is a concept expressed by two or more words in the respective region [*wherein semantic equivalents of names of a business are found while performing name matching, wherein for example if a name entry uses the abbreviation 'inc', this is expanded to include the word 'incorporated' as part of a business name, col. 43, line 27 - col. 44, line 5*];

matching the first content region with a first advertisement from a set of advertisements by comparing the previously determined first local concept with a meaning of the first advertisement; matching the second content region with a second advertisement from the set of advertisements by comparing the previously determined second local concept with a meaning of the second advertisement [*wherein sets of categories matching those input into a query are compared with advertisements that correspond to the categories, col. 36, line 54 - col. 37, line 16; wherein one or more*

banner advertisements are matched to super-categories, Fig. 68-69, col. 61, line 50 - col. 64, line 21]; and

causing the previously matched advertisements to be displayed on the source web page document at a display device [wherein user receives corresponding advertisements, col. 37, lines 8-16; see Fig. 43-44 and related portions of specification; targeted banner advertisements displayed, col. 61, lines 33-36].

Regarding claim 30, Chipalkatti discloses causing the first advertisement to be displayed in the first content region and causing the second advertisement to be displayed in the second content region [*wherein targeted banner ads corresponding to their respective super-categories are displayed; geographical banner ads, col. 61, line 26 – col. 65, line 61; Fig. 43-44, 68 and 69*].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 1-9, 11-22, 24-27, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,484,161 issued to Chipalkatti et al (hererafter

Chipalkatti), and further in view of US Patent 5,687,364 issued to Saund et al (hereafter Saund).

Referring to claim 1, Chipalkatti discloses a method [*see Title of Invention*] comprising:

- receiving a source web page document [*wherein a resulting HTML page including the data in display format is delivered to the user's browser, col. 17, lines 4-36; expanded PHTML representation (file) is received, col. 17, lines 37-59*];
- identifying a plurality of regions in the previously received source web page document [*wherein a search returns a plurality of objects corresponding to n categories and up to m listings for each of the categories, col. 20, lines 60-62; wherein the categories corresponding to the retrieved documents are displayed, the PHTML execution trees may cause the parse driver to obtain information from the generic object dictionary that identifies each category, col. 21-22, lines 64-67 and lines 1-2*];
- determining at least one local concept expressed in each previously identified region [*wherein the information retrieval software may determine categories into which the retrieved documents fall, col. 34, lines 29-34*], wherein determining the at least one concept comprises identifying words in the document and aligning the words with concepts, wherein a local concept expressed in a region is a concept expressed by two or more words in the region [*wherein categories 'restaurants' and 'bowling' are associated (i.e. aligned) and retrieved in response*

to a search result 'Joe's restaurant and bowling alley' stemming from a user query for a restaurant (i.e. the term 'restaurant' is identified), col. 34, lines 29-54; wherein if the term 'diner' appears in a business listing, then the term 'restaurant' in addition to other synonyms (col. 33, lines 27-30) might be assigned to the file for that business listing, col. 33, lines 24-30; also 'restaurant' may be stored (aligned) together with subcategories 'ethnic restaurant' and further subcategory 'greek restaurant', col. 33, lines 30-34];

- analyzing the previously determined local concepts of each region to identify one or more unrelated concepts having a relatively low degree of relationship with local concepts of other regions [*wherein the information retrieval software may compare the categories identified to the terms in the user query wherein if categories are present that do not include any of the terms in the user query, then such categories may be disregarded, thus the user will not retrieve categories that are unrelated to the user query, such categories might otherwise appear for example, if the information retrieval software retrieves a business listing that is associated with two unrelated categories only one of which is relevant to the user query, col. 34, lines 43-50; Examiner submits that the one category 'bowling' out of the two unrelated categories returned by the software has a relatively low degree of relationship to the category term 'restaurant' in the query and therefore reads on the recited 'identify one or more unrelated concepts having a relatively low degree of relationship with local concepts of other regions*];

- eliminating the previously identified unrelated concepts from a determination of a source meaning for the source web page document [*wherein the bowling category would be discarded because the user query for a restaurant is unrelated to the bowling category, col. 34, lines 55-67; wherein term comparisons are made using expanded terms via synonyms of the query terms and categories, col. 34, lines 57-67*]; and
- matching the source web page document with an item selected from a set of items by comparing the previously determined source meaning and a meaning of the item [*wherein categories that match a queried category such as 'art supplies' are used to further retrieve corresponding sub-categories or documents such as advertisements or other markup language pages, col. 37, lines 2-16*].

Referring to claim 1, Chipalkatti discloses all of the above claimed subject matter and also discloses that the terms in the user query and the terms in each of the matching relevant categories returned are weighted and a linked list for the terms is established that includes statistics regarding the document including term frequency, TF which indicates the number of times a term appears in the document, and the inverse document frequency IDF [*col. 64, lines 22-58*]. In addition, Chipalkatti discloses calculation of a domain weight and server weights that are based on the costs (e.g. time) associated with processing a request [*col. 7, lines 23-32*].

However, Chipalkatti remains silent as to specifically teaching that the source meaning for the source web page document is a **weighted vector of the relevant concepts**.

However, Saund teaches analogous art that includes determining a source meaning of documents through a weighted vector of relevant concepts [*wherein the topical content of documents is computed by calculating a topic belief (observed feature) vector for each document in a set of documents and by setting association strengths (weights) to certain values, wherein each vector represents for its associated document which words of a lexicon are present, col. 1, line 52-col. 2, line 8*].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Chipalkatti to include determining a source meaning of documents through a weighted vector of relevant concepts, as taught by Saund.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Chipalkatti per the above for the purpose of characterizing the topical content of documents from their lexical content in an unsupervised computerized manner [*Saund, Field of Invention*].

The limitations of claim 14 are similar to those of claim 1 in the form of an article comprising one or more computer-readable media containing program code [*Chipalkatti, software tools executing in a computer system, col. 1, lines 35-46; Fig. 4 and related portions of specification*]. As such, claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

Referring to claim 36, Chipalkatti discloses a method for determining a source meaning for a web page document, the method performed by a document server implemented as a network of computer processors or as a single computer system, the document server executing a document engine, the method comprising:

- receiving a web page document [*wherein a resulting HTML page including the data in display format is delivered to the user's browser, col. 17, lines 4-36; expanded PHTML representation (file) is received, col. 17, lines 37-59;*]
- identifying a collection of different regions in the previously received web page document [*wherein a search returns a plurality of objects corresponding to n categories and up to m listings for each of the categories, col. 20, lines 60-62; wherein the categories corresponding to the retrieved documents are displayed, the PHTML execution trees may cause the parse driver to obtain information from the generic object dictionary that identifies each category, col. 21-22, lines 64-67 and lines 1-2;*]
- determining concepts expressed in each of the different previously identified regions in the collection [*wherein the information retrieval software may determine categories into which the retrieved documents fall, col. 34, lines 29-34,* wherein determining the concepts expressed in each of the different regions comprises identifying words in each of the different regions and

- aligning the words with concepts, wherein concept is expressed in a region two or more words in the region are aligned with the concept [*wherein categories 'restaurants' and 'bowling' are associated (i.e. aligned) and retrieved in response to a search result 'Joe's restaurant and bowling alley' stemming from a user query for a restaurant (i.e. the term 'restaurant' is identified), col. 34, lines 29-54; wherein if the term 'diner' appears in a business listing, then the term 'restaurant' in addition to other synonyms (col. 33, lines 27-30) might be assigned to the file for that business listing, col. 33, lines 24-30; also 'restaurant' may be stored (aligned) together with subcategories 'ethnic restaurant' and further subcategory 'greek restaurant', col. 33, lines 30-34*];
- identifying a first concept that was determined to be expressed in a first region as having a relatively low degree of relationship, and hence being unrelated to concepts expressed in other regions in the collection [*wherein the information retrieval software may compare the categories identified to the terms in the user query wherein if categories are present that do not include any of the terms in the user query, then such categories may be disregarded, thus the user will not retrieve categories that are unrelated to the user query, such categories might otherwise appear for example, if the information retrieval software retrieves a business listing that is associated with two unrelated categories only one of which is relevant to the user query, col. 34, lines 43-50; Examiner submits that the one category 'bowling' out of the two*

unrelated categories returned by the software has a relatively low degree of relationship to the category term 'restaurant' in the query and therefore reads on the recited 'identifying a first [unrelated] concept ..having a relatively low degree of relationship [with] .. concepts expressed in other regions];

- determining the source meaning for the web page document, wherein determining the source meaning includes excluding the previously identified first concept from the determination of the source meaning [*wherein the bowling category would be discarded because the user query for a restaurant is unrelated to the bowling category, col. 34, lines 55-67; wherein term comparisons are made using expanded terms via synonyms of the query terms and categories, col. 34, lines 57-67*]; and
- making the previously determined source meaning available [*display of results page, col. 35, lines 3-10; col. 16, lines 17-18*].

Referring to claim 36, Chipalkatti discloses all of the above claimed subject matter and also discloses that the terms in the user query and the terms in each of the matching relevant categories returned are weighted and a linked list for the terms is established that includes statistics regarding the document including term frequency, TF which indicates the number of times a term appears in the document, and the inverse document frequency IDF [*col. 64, lines 22-58*]. In addition, Chipalkatti discloses

calculation of a domain weight and server weights that are based on the costs (e.g. time) associated with processing a request [*col. 7, lines 23-32*].

However, Chipalkatti remains silent as to specifically teaching that the source meaning is a **vector of representative concepts**.

However, Saund teaches analogous art that includes determining a source meaning of documents through a vector of representative related concepts [*wherein the topical content of documents is computed by calculating a topic belief (observed feature) vector for each document in a set of documents and by setting association strengths (weights) to certain values, wherein each vector represents for its associated document which words of a lexicon are present, col. 1, line 52-col. 2, line 8*].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Chipalkatti to include determining a source meaning of documents through a vector of representative concepts, as taught by Saund.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Chipalkatti per the above for the purpose of characterizing the topical content of documents from their lexical content in an unsupervised computerized manner [*Saund, Field of Invention*].

Referring to claims 2 and 15, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses causing the matched item to be displayed on the source web page document at a display device [*Chipalkatti, wherein if the user enters the category "art supplies", the information retrieval software may retrieve a set of matching categories that relate to art*

supplies, wherein the retrieved categories may be order alphabetically by, order of significance, or grouped by sub categories, col. 37, lines 2-16; Fig. 44 and related portions of specification].

Referring to claims 3 and 16, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that the matched item comprises a keyword [*Chipalkatti, wherein the following information is extracted from the original query string as formed by the parser: category, category id, keywords, etc, col 31, lines 22-26, Fig. 11*].

Referring to claims 4 and 17, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that the matched item comprises an advertisement [*Chipalkatti, wherein the business listings relating to the user specified search criteria selection relating to "custom made shoes", wherein the user selects one of the businesses for more information pertaining to the business such as directions and business provided advertisements, column 10, lines 32-37; Fig 15*].

Referring to claims 5 and 18, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses displaying content associated with the matched item on the source web page document/article [*Chipalkatti, wherein the business listings relating to the user specified search criteria selection relating to "custom made shoes", wherein the user selects one*

of the businesses for more information pertaining to the business such as directions and business provided advertisements, column 10, lines 32-37; Fig 15].

Referring to claims 6 and 19, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that the matched item comprises a keyword [*Chipalkatti, wherein the following information is extracted from the original query string as formed by the parser: category, category id, keywords, etc, col 31, lines 22-26, Fig. 11*]; and the associated content comprises an advertisement [*Chipalkatti, wherein the business listings relating to the user specified search criteria selection relating to "custom made shoes", wherein the user selects one of the businesses for more information pertaining to the business such as directions and business provided advertisements, column 10, lines 32-37; Fig 15*].

Referring to claims 7 and 20, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that the matched item comprises a second web page; and the associated content comprises an advertisement [*Chipalkatti, col. 37, lines 3-16*].

Referring to claims 8 and 21, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that the matched item comprises a second web page; and the associated content comprises a link to the second web page [*Chipalkatti, col. 64, lines 28-68*].

Referring to claims 9 and 22, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that matching the source web page document with the item comprises matching the source web page document with the item using a biasing factor [*Chipalkatti, statistical bias, col. 18, line 66 – col. 19, line 13*].

Referring to claims 11 and 25, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that determining at least one local concept comprises determining a score for each local concept [*Chipalkatti, wherein the following types of fields of information are stored according to relevance information and advertiser priority, in which the relevance information is verity specific information as it relates to the query, wherein this generally represents the frequency of words or terms in the document, column 30, lines 1-6*]; and the local concept with the highest score in each region comprises a most relevant local concepts concept for that region [*Chipalkatti, column 30, lines 8-16*].

Referring to claims 12 and 26, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses:

- determining a revised score for each local concept [*Chipalkatti, columns 40-41, lines 64-67 and lines 1-17*];
- determining a ranked global list of all local concepts based on the revised scores [*Chipalkatti, column 26, lines 50-52*];

- removing local concepts whose combined revised score contributes less than a predetermined amount of a total score of the global list to produce a resulting list [*Chipalkatti, Figure 4, element 834, column 7, lines 1-11*];
- identifying unrelated regions without a most relevant local concept on the resulting list [*Chipalkatti, Refer to limitation addressed in claim 1 above*]; and
- removing local concepts **expressed in** the unrelated regions from the resulting list to produce a list of relevant concepts [*Chipalkatti, Refer to limitation addressed in claim 1 above*].

Referring to claims 13 and 27, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses normalizing the revised scores for the relevant concepts [*Chipalkatti, wherein normalized data is illustrated, column 13, lines 57-60 and columns 40-41, lines 64-67 and lines 1-17; Figure 25, element 900*].

Referring to claim 24, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses eliminating the unrelated concepts comprises ranking the related local concepts [*Chipalkatti, col. 37, lines 25-44*].

Referring to claim 37, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that identifying the collection of different regions in the document comprises identifying frames in the web page document [*Chipalkatti, wherein more tools are defined, which*

includes shop online, consumer guide, web site search, etc. wherein this is interpreted to be the frames in a web page document, Fig. 13].

Referring to claim 38, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that identifying the collection of different regions in the web page document comprises identifying the different regions based on markup in the web page document [Chipalkatti, *different regions based on a business information document, see Figure 22*].

Referring to claim 39, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that determining the concepts comprises identifying collections of related words in each of the different regions in the collection [Chipalkatti, *wherein term lists are business listing that are expanded to include synonyms and terms that are determined to be related to the words in the business listing, wherein the business listings are categorized in different regions, see Figure 36, elements 254, 256, and 258; column 33, lines 50-57*].

Referring to claim 40, the combination of Chipalkatti/Saund discloses that based on the concepts expressed in each of the different regions in the collection, selecting one or more advertisements [Chipalkatti, *wherein sets of categories matching those input into a query are compared with advertisements that correspond to the categories, col. 36, line 54 - col. 37, line 16; wherein one or more banner advertisements are matched to super-categories, Fig. 68-69, col. 61, line 50 - col. 64, line 21*]; and making

the web page document and the selected advertisements available for output [Chipalkatti, *wherein user receives corresponding advertisements, col. 37, lines 8-16; see Fig. 43-44 and related portions of specification; targeted banner advertisements displayed, col. 61, lines 33-36*].

Conclusion

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M Shechtman who can be reached on (571) 272-4018. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chong Kim can be reached on (571) 272-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CMS

Examiner, Art Unit 2157

April 20, 2012

/CHARLES KIM/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157